

THE REMONSTRANCE.

BOSTON, APRIL, 1907.

The Remonstrance is published by the Massachusetts Association Opposed to the Further Extension of Suffrage to Women. It expresses the views of women in Massachusetts, Maine, Rhode Island, New York, Illinois, Iowa, Oregon, Washington, and other states who believe that the great majority of their sex do not want the ballot, and that to force it upon them would not only be an injustice to women, but would lessen their influence for good and imperil the community. The Remonstrants ask a thoughtful consideration of their views in the interest of fair discussion.

Massachusetts Association Opposed to the Further Extension of Suffrage to Women.

Thirty-two Branch Committees; members in 345 cities, towns, and villages.

MRS. G. HOWLAND SHAW, President.
MRS. HENRY M. WHITNEY, } Vice-
MRS. EBEN S. DRAPER, } Presidents.
MRS. JAMES M. CODMAN, Treasurer,
Walnut Street, Brookline.
MISS ELIZABETH JOHNSON,

Recording Sec'y.

MISS L. C. POST, Cor. Sec'y,
P. O. Box 134, Brookline.

Hearings by Massachusetts Legislative Committees and Action by the Legislature on Suffrage Measures in 1907.

A SUFFRAGE AMENDMENT.

THERE was a hearing before the Committee on Constitutional Amendments at the State House, February 5, on a petition for an amendment to the Constitution, striking the word "male" from the qualifications of voters. Mrs. Charles Park, representing the Massachusetts Woman Suffrage Association, conducted the hearing for the petitioners; Mr. Charles R. Saunders, counsel for the Massachusetts Association Opposed to the Further Extension of Suffrage to Women, conducted it for the remonstrants.

Speakers for the Petition.

Prof. George C. Gardner, of the Boston University Law School, declared that the sex qualification for the suffrage was absurd and unreasonable. Mrs. Park cited statistics to show how many single women and widows there are who are not represented by men voters. Mr. Frank K. Foster, representing the Federation of Labor, said that his association was practically unanimous in favor of woman suffrage. Mrs. G. I. Clark, of Holyoke, spoke especially in behalf of mothers. Mr. Arthur Perry, of Boston, expressed his opinion that woman suffrage would result in practical improvement. Mrs. Florence Kelley, secretary of the National Consumers' League, deplored the fact that Massachusetts had lost its leadership in the care of women and children who work, and announced that this leadership had passed to Colorado. Mr. Philip Davis, of the Civic Service House, made an argument for woman suffrage from the social worker's point of view. A letter was read from Miss Margaret Long, describing conditions in Colorado since women were given the ballot. After the remonstrants were heard, Miss Alice Stone Blackwell spoke briefly in rebuttal.

The Views of the Remonstrants

were expressed first in a paper read by Mrs. J. B. Millet, which was signed by Mrs. G. Howland Shaw, President of the Massachusetts Association Opposed to the Further Extension of Suffrage to Women. This paper was in part as follows:

"It is with great reluctance that our association appears once more before a committee of the Massachusetts Legislature. We come here simply in self-defence.

"We do not desire the rights of men. Neither do we wish to perform their duties. We rejoice that we are not called upon for military service. We do not desire to serve on juries, and we value highly our exemption from political strife and controversy. These are to-day our rights and privileges, and we ask you to guard them for us.

"Year after year some new attempt is made to secure some form of woman suffrage. Our association is composed of more than 12,000 women who have associated themselves together to resist such attempts.

"They are women of twenty-one years and upwards residing in 245 towns and villages from Berkshire to Cape Cod. They belong to all classes and conditions of life. Many of them are tax-paying women. Others are wage-earners, dependent on their daily labor of hand or brain. We unite in the belief that the change proposed would be injurious to women themselves and a misfortune for the state.

"The right to vote belongs now only to men. You cannot give it to the women who request it without imposing it on all women, whether they wish it or not.

"We are told how easy it is to deposit a ballot, as if nothing more were required. But the amendment to the Constitution, which is asked for to-day, would introduce women to all the political controversies hitherto confined to men. They would be expected to attend town meetings, to study municipal problems and to be present at political caucuses.

"Women now stand outside politics. We are neither Republicans nor Democrats, and therefore our suggestions and requests in matters of education, charity, and general reform are welcomed and heeded. No suspicion arises that we have partisan ends to serve.

"Women are willing and ready to do their share in public and charitable work. For many years their services have been sought in almost every movement for local benefit or reform. Village and town improvement societies all over the state are composed largely of women. They serve on school committees where their election has come almost exclusively by the votes of men. They are to be found upon almost every board of library trustees. They are chosen as overseers of the poor and as trustees of city institutions, both for the care of paupers and children. They are appointed by the Governor on our boards of hospitals, of charities, and of prisons. In all these posts a woman's opinion now has equal

weight with a Republican or a Democratic official. Her views on national politics do not concern her duties or affect her relations with men of either party.

"We ask you not to deprive us of these advantages."

Miss Mary A. McIntire,
of Cambridge, said:

"We do not need the ballot, and we do not want the ballot. We do not need the ballot,—

"Because every educational advantage is already ours;

"Because we believe that suffrage is a duty (which we do not wish to assume) and not a right;

"Because all trades and professions are now open to women. In literature, music, art, medicine, on the stage, and in specialized industries, we receive a like (sometimes greater) wage than men. Where wages are lower for women, the causes lie mainly in the temporary nature of woman's work and the overcrowding of certain trades and professions;

"Because we do not believe that woman's vote would 'elevate politics.' It is not a question of giving the vote to the exceptional woman only, but to all;

"We do not need the ballot to protect our property interests. Woman's property receives the same protection as man's, and we believe that men, from their training, are better able to protect our property interests than we would be ourselves;

"We do not need the ballot here in Massachusetts to improve our legal standing. Our legislators have placed women in a position envied by other countries and states.

"Moreover, we hold that woman has more power for good without than with the ballot. Woman's duty to the state is the development of wholesome and progressive public opinion; man's share is putting it into that practical form we call government."

Miss Frances J. Dyer,
of Boston, in a letter to Mrs. C. E. Guild, which Mr. Saunders read, said:

"No doubt there are many wage-earners like myself who would be glad to attend the hearings at the State House, but who cannot leave their business for that purpose. Most of us have aged parents or others dependent upon our earnings, or upon our personal ministry in the home, and this is another reason why

we cannot take time for outside interests. To add political duties to our other burdens would be a cruel injustice. Therefore, no one appreciates the valuable work of your association more than women who are struggling with the difficult problem of self-support. We, above all others, need the protection and moral support of just such an organization.

"May those who voice our side at the hearing this year carry conviction to the minds of the committee."

Mrs. A. J. George,
of Brookline, said in substance:

"The remonstrants believe as firmly as your petitioners that woman should play her part in the civic order to the full extent of her powers. Our difference is one of methods, not of aims. I appreciate the suffragists' position, because I have been a suffragist; but the experience of life has taught me that it is the part of wisdom for woman to attempt to do those things for which she is fitted by nature and to leave to man those things for which he is fitted.

"As I have listened to the petitioners, particularly to the lady from New York (Mrs. Florence Kelley), I have wondered what change has come over our Massachusetts laws since May, 1904, when, at the St. Louis Biennial Convention of Women's Clubs, she prescribed as a good national law 'three quarters of the law in Massachusetts plus one quarter of the New York law, with a dash of Illinois, served hot.' Neither Mr. Horace Wadlin, in 1902, nor Mr. Homer Folks, in 1905, pointed to Colorado laws regarding women and children as a standard; but Mr. Wadlin, and he is an equal suffragist, did say that the Massachusetts laws affecting children in industry were the best not only in this country, but in the civilized world.

"Your committee has been told that the industrial woman needs the ballot in order to be furnished with that 'leverage which the ballot sometimes gives.' But the last census of the United States shows that of the females gainfully employed, almost one third (32.4 per cent) were under twenty-one years of age. These naturally could not vote. Close to one half (49.3 per cent) were under twenty-five years of age. These would scarcely have the experience which would make them desirable political factors, and they are not growing older as industrial women, but are constantly leaving the wage-earning

group to marry; for we are told that nine out of ten marry, and of the married women only 5.6 per cent are in gainful occupations. Since the average woman marries, and since about 83 per cent of our households are without domestic servants of any kind, it is a true statement, even if a homely one, that the average woman to-day is already busied with affairs which demand her best output of time and energy.

"In continental United States 5,319,397 females ten years of age and over are gainfully employed. But the sum of those engaged in agricultural pursuits, professional service and domestic and personal service equals 65.9 per cent of all females gainfully employed; while the sum of those engaged in trade and transportation and manufacturing and mechanical pursuits—the occupations most organized under trade unions, and to which it is specially urged that the ballot would be helpful,—equals only 34.1 per cent of the number of females gainfully employed.

"The life of the average man is in the market-place, where he daily hears matters akin to politics discussed; but the life of the average woman is in the home. You are asked to set in motion the machinery which shall bring about what Gladstone called a 'revolutionary change.' We ask you not to take that action."

Miss Emily P. Bissell,
of Wilmington, Del., in a letter to Mrs. Shaw which Mr. Saunders read, said:

"It was in Massachusetts that the woman suffrage agitation began, more than half a century ago. And the thing which strikes the outside woman, as she considers this Fifty Years' War, is the waste of energy on an inferior cause. Fifty years ago the American woman felt the need of greater usefulness, without having any particular avenues of expansion open to her. The woman suffrage movement was proclaimed as the necessary foundation-stone of woman's usefulness. Unfortunately for its leaders, but fortunately for our sex, other foundations were laid and the building commenced. To-day woman possesses the freedom, the education, the civic value, which was desired fifty years ago. The tower of her usefulness reaches to the skies, while the so-called 'foundation-stone' of the ballot lies at one side, passed without a thought by the hurrying steps of the average busy woman. The suffragists now urge the ballot as a cap-stone instead of a

foundation-stone. To those of us who have taken time to think about woman suffrage, neither argument appeals, the old or the new. We need no suffrage foundation; we want no suffrage cap-stone. We look to other women than the suffrage leaders for the best expression of the American woman's hopes and aims. We are sorry they are wasting their talents on a cause that is not supported by the majority of intelligent women. The effort and money of the National Suffrage Association have just been poured out in its second campaign in Oregon, only to find itself defeated by many more votes than in the first battle. If all this effort and money could have been utilized in the cause, let us say, of child-labor reform, in which all American women are one (and which is therefore going to succeed) it would have been utilized for victory and not lost in defeat.

"The average intelligent woman knows little and cares nothing about suffrage. The woman busy in charitable or sociological work, in a few cases, takes it up as an adjunct, but never as her main end. Certainly, the lines on which women are most valuable in public work lie entirely apart from politics. The moment politics comes in, value is lost. To take municipal and charitable problems out of politics is the effort of all the wisest workers to-day, and the very fact that a woman has no vote makes her an ideal municipal worker. It is impossible to-day for a self-seeking or unscrupulous woman to become prominent in sociological work. There is no self-interest in it to attract her, and no 'job' for her to seek. We get the disinterested service of the noblest women of America in our social and civic problems under present methods. What more could we get from the ballot? And how much might we lose by the intrusion of the woman politician?"

Mr. Charles R. Saunders,
of Boston, closed for the remonstrants:

"The fundamental objection to woman suffrage, he said, is that it gives the power to make the laws to those who have not got the power to enforce them. Government, in its final analysis, rests on force. Laws will not enforce themselves. Under male suffrage, after an election, the minority submits, not because it is convinced it was wrong, but because it knows the majority can, if put to the test, enforce its will.

"There is a money tax and a service tax," he remarked. "The money tax is levied on the property of men, women, minors, and aliens alike, and all get the same things in return,—schools, roads, lighting, fire and police protection. The service tax is levied on men alone and with this tax goes the right to vote. American freedom depends on the ballot box, the jury box, and the cartridge box. Woman suffragists ask complete use of the ballot box, little or no use of the jury box, and entire exemption from use of the cartridge box on which both the others depend for existence. The suffrage they ask is of the most unequal kind—suffrage with all the rights of men and none of their responsibilities.

"The Territory of Washington, after an experience with woman suffrage, withdrew the ballot from women by a vote of more than two to one, upon becoming a state. The woman suffrage state of Wyoming has eleven causes for divorce, and residence there for six months is sufficient to sever the tie. Oregon, which rejected woman suffrage in 1900, by only 2,000 majority, rejected it last year by over 10,000 majority."

"Many distinguished persons," he said, "who started in life as woman suffragists have come to oppose it on mature reflection." Among them he cited Horace Bushnell, John Bright, Goldwin Smith, Herbert Spencer, William E. Gladstone, and Bishop Vincent, the founder of Chautauqua. President Briggs, of Radcliffe College, and President Lefavour, of Simmons College, great women's colleges, are opposed to woman suffrage.

In reply to Mrs. Kelley's unfavorable comparison of Massachusetts with Colorado, in the matter of laws for the protection of women and children, Mr. Saunders said that he had carefully examined the laws of the four woman suffrage states, Wyoming, Colorado, Idaho, and Utah, in respect to labor of women and children, and that the laws of Massachusetts contained more protection for women and children in that regard than the laws of all these suffrage states put together. He quoted from an address last year by Judge Lindsey, of Colorado, before the Twentieth Century Club in Boston, in which Judge Lindsey said that Massachusetts had "the best school law and the best labor law," and had given them in Colorado the probation system. Mr. Saunders also read from another address last year by Judge Lindsey, before the Massachusetts Civic League, the Massa-

chusetts Prison Association, and the Twentieth Century Club, in which the judge said that Massachusetts had set the entire country a "magnificent example" in her child labor and school laws.

The 12,000 women opposed to women suffrage, whom he represented, were engaged, he said, in home duties and in educational, philanthropic and charitable work. As there were fields where women could do better work than men, so in the field of politics men could do better work than women. Women ought not to be asked to enter the hurly-burly of politics in addition to their other cares. Politics cannot be made better, but only worse, by forcing this burden upon women to whom its contentions and wranglings are repugnant, and who have more duties now than they have time and strength to perform.

Action on the Amendment.

The Committee on Constitutional Amendments voted, 8 to 3, to report "reference to the next General Court" on the proposed amendment. The report was made to the House February 15, and was debated February 20. Representative Walker, of Brookline, moved to substitute the amendment for the adverse report of the committee. Representatives Walker and White, of Brookline, Duane, of Waltham, and Coleman, of Nantucket, spoke in favor of the motion, and Representatives Higgins, of Somerville, Birch, of Milford, Hardy, of Arlington, and Newton, of Boston, spoke against it. The vote resulted: 14 for the motion and 125 against it. The report of the committee was then accepted, *viva voce*. The Senate, February 26, accepted the adverse report of the committee without debate or division.

A LICENSE SUFFRAGE BILL.

A HEARING was held on Thursday, February 14, before the Committee on Election Laws, on a petition for legislation to give women the right to vote on the question of granting licenses for the sale of liquors. The room was well filled, and those in attendance seemed to be about equally divided between petitioners and remonstrants.

The Petitioners' Case

was conducted by Mr. Albert Sutcliffe, representing the order of Good Templars. The speakers were Mr. Sutcliffe, who urged that temperance would be promoted by giving women the license ballot; Rev. A. F. Bailey, of Barre, who argued that women's interest in temperance was greater than in the schools; Mr. S. H. Davis, of the Anti-Saloon League, who favored the petition in the interest of No-license; Mrs. Katherine L. Stevenson, of the W. C. T. U., who took the ground that women had equal responsibility and an equal duty with men as regards the welfare of society; Rev. Mr. Ferguson, of Ballardvale, who depicted the misery of the drunkard's home; and Senator Charles Prouty, of Spencer, Mr. Robert F. Magwood, of the Temperance Department of the Y. P. S. C. E., Mr. W. E. Thomas, of Boston, and Mr. Weeks, of Cambridge, who urged the granting of the petition on moral grounds.

The Case of the Remonstrants

was conducted by Mr. Charles R. Saunders, counsel for the Massachusetts Association Opposed to the Further Extension of Suffrage to Women. A statement in behalf of the Association, signed by Mrs. G. Howland Shaw, president, was read by Mrs. J. B. Millet of Boston. This statement was in substance as follows:

When school suffrage was granted to women, it was urged that above all other questions the management of the schools peculiarly appealed to women and that they required the ballot to give expression to their views. School suffrage was granted, but it has not proved an unqualified success. In many towns no women vote at all, and they have certainly failed to show the interest which was predicted. Now the license ballot is asked for on the ground that it would promote temperance. That it would have this effect we do not believe. The small towns now usually vote No-license, and in the larger cities good judges doubt whether the votes of women would favorably affect the result. The wisdom of No-license in large communities depends wholly on the possibility of its enforcement.

It is not by license suffrage for women that the temperance question can be settled. Nor can the votes of men always decide the establishment of saloons. This was shown eleven years ago when the men in the out-

lying wards of Boston found themselves as powerless as the women to forbid the location of barrooms near their homes. At that time the law permitted one license in Boston for every 500 of the population, and under the new census 97 new licenses were to be authorized. The location of these saloons rested with the Police Commissioners, who were not elected by the voters. But after many debates and conferences, both at the State House and among friends of temperance outside, a bill was passed forbidding such increase of licenses in the future, and securing the present fixed number of 1,000 licenses for Boston. We have now nearly 200 fewer saloons under this law of 1899 than would have existed under the former ratio of population. We are confident that Mr. Saunders, the present counsel, who was largely instrumental in securing this legislation, and his associates will bear witness that the wishes of Boston women were as much considered in this matter as if they had been entitled to vote at all elections.

Mrs. C. M. Lamson, of Boston,

editor of the woman's missionary magazine "Life and Light," said that all agree that the temperance question is vital to women; the only disagreement is about methods. She spoke for many thousand women, eager to help the temperance cause, who feel that the proposed legislation would be an injury rather than a benefit. She reminded Mrs. Stevenson that the split in the ranks of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, some years ago, was evidence that not all temperance women are in favor of trying to reach their end through woman suffrage. If by their votes women should change a community from License to No-license, they would have no power to carry out that policy, and the result would be demoralizing. A law not enforced is worse than no law. If women were to attempt to wield force, an unnatural weapon, they would lose the advantage of their natural weapons.

Mr. Frank Foxcroft, of Cambridge,

for fifteen years chairman of the No-license committee of that city, which has voted No-license for twenty-one years, was the next speaker introduced.

"Three fourths of Massachusetts cities and towns," he said, "vote No-license now. The effect of the women's vote would be weakening and mischievous. The strength of

No-license in Cambridge has been that the decision was made each year by the men voters. The same voters who voted the system in and kept it in, voted for the officers to enforce it. In any year, if the officials had been lax in enforcing the law, the men voters could have displaced them. If No-license had been adopted by the women's vote, it could not have been sustained, because that vote could not be made efficient in compelling enforcement of the system. Would it be a real advantage to have a few license cities and towns carried No-license by the votes of the women? Suppose Boston were carried No-License by the vote of the women. What sort of enforcement of No-license would you have? Neither the restrictions, which go with No-license, nor those which attend license could be applied, as it would be the men voters who would elect the city officials. The bill should be rejected in the interest of No-license and temperance, for it would work mischief in places now carried for No-license, and chaos in those that do not so vote, but which might be carried by the women's vote."

Mr. Saunders

closed for the remonstrants:

He said that public opinion is settling the liquor question. There are fewer licenses in Boston than there were ten years ago. Spirituous liquors are yielding to malt liquors, and the latter to tonics. Prohibition in Massachusetts from 1852 to 1868 and from 1869 to 1875 was a farce. Jurors would not convict where public sentiment did not sustain the law. Vermont and New Hampshire have abandoned prohibition, and Maine is moving the same way. The people of Massachusetts having voted against prohibition by 46,000 majority, it is proposed to secure prohibition by universal No-license through the women's votes. To give the ballot to women on this question, with no right to vote for the officials to enforce the policy, would be disastrous. This bill imposes on 600,000 women additional political burdens which they have neither time, strength, nor inclination to perform.

Action on the Bill.

The Committee on Election Laws reported unanimously against the bill. Its report was made to the Senate, February 18, and was accepted unanimously, February 19. The House concurred, also unanimously, February 25.